

Appln. No. 10/752,925
Amendment dated November 3, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 5, 2005

REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 5 and 7 through 10 remain in this application. Claim 6 has have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn. Claims 11 and 12 have been added.

Paragraphs 1 through 4 of the Office Action

Claims 1 through 5 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters.

Claims 6 through 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters in view of Smith.

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peters and Smith.

Claims 1 and 10, particularly as amended, each require "wherein each said sensor of said plurality of sensors is a light-sensitive detector actuated when said sensor is exposed to light" and "wherein each said sensor of said plurality of sensors is mounted on said bottom wall of said compartment of said tray such that placement of paper money in said compartment blocks light from reaching said sensor and removal of paper money from the compartment exposes said sensor to light". This claimed positioning of the light-sensitive detector, and the relationship with money positioned in the compartment, permits the alarm system to be activated when money is removed from the particular compartment, and not simply when the cash drawer is opened. Thus, the claimed system is less likely to be accidentally triggered by simply opening the drawer, and instead detects a change in the positioning of money in the drawer.

In contrast, the Smith patent, which is relied upon in the rejection as allegedly showing the claimed sensors, does not provide any particularly ity

Appln. No. 10/752,925
Amendment dated November 3, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed August 5, 2005

as to the positioning of the photosensitive actuator (22), and the text at col. 5, lines 40 et seq. suggests that the photosensitive actuator is merely triggered by opening the drawer, regardless of whether money is actually removed from the drawer.

It is therefore submitted that the cited patents, and especially the allegedly obvious combination of Peters and Smith set forth in the rejection of the Office Action, would not lead one skilled in the art to the applicant's invention as required by claims 1 and 10. Further, claims 2 through 5 and 7 through 9, which depend from claim 1, also include the requirements discussed above and therefore are also submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 5 and 7 through 10 is therefore respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)
Customer No. 40,158
P.O. Box 5027
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357

Date:

Nov 3, 2005